



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,908	12/14/2001	Edgar Cirrenis	10016872-1	4229
7590 01/06/2009 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, TAN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3689	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/014,908	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CIRKENIS, EDGAR
	<b>Examiner</b> Tan Dean D. Nguyen	<b>Art Unit</b> 3689

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on **24 September 2008**.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) **1-30** is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) **1-30** is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/DS/02)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. The amendment of 9/24/08 has been entered. Claims 1-30 are pending and rejected as followed.

***Claims Status***

2. As of 9/24/08, claims 1-30 are pending. There are 3 method claims: 10-15, 16-23, and 24-30 with 1 system claim 1-9 which is basically the system to carry out the first method claim 10-15. Claim 10 appears to be the broadest method claim and will be addressed first.

As of 3/27/08, independent method claim 10 is as followed:

10. (currently amended) A method for measuring usage at least one asset class over a network with a plurality of instant capacity on demand (iCOD) computers comprising:

(a) receiving data about a quantity of assets of the at least one asset class for each iCOD computers on the network,

(b) summing the quantity of assets of the at least one asset class for all of the plurality of iCOD computers on the network, thereby obtaining a sum of assets for the at least one asset class;

(c) providing a notification if the sum of assets differs from a previously specified total for the assets for the at least one asset class, and

(d) allowing payment-free transfer of assets from one iCOD computer to another iCOD computer within the network.

Note: for convenience, alphabetical letters (a) – (c) are added to the beginning of each step.

Also, as in step (d), the phrase "allowing payment-free transfer of assets from one iCOD computer to another iCOD computer within the network" basically reads "permits a task of payment-free transfer" and wherein the "task" is to execute the transfer. In other word, "permitting an action" is different from actually "performing an action". "Causing" or "permitting" only requires serving as the reason for an action though, not necessarily performing the action. This can be done by issuing commands or orders, or entering into contracts. So even though the entity may do something later with the equipment that is in the technological arts, the positively recited steps of merely "causing" can be done without operating the equipment and is not in the technological arts. Variations on this theme have been seen in other cases, using terms like "allowing" or "permitting" an action, e.g. "allowing a user to search a database". Again, these steps are distinct from actually doing the action, e.g. searching.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 10-15, 16-23 and 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 based on Supreme Court precedent, and recent Federal Circuit decisions, the Office's guidance to

examiners is that a § 101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584,588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876). These method claims do not exhibit transformation in the body of the claim nor are they tied to another statutory class such as using or implemented by a computer. Insertion of the use of another statutory class (computer) such as "computer-implemented" or "using a computer" features in the preamble and in essential steps of the claims are recommended.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. **Claims 10-15, 16-23, 1-9, 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (1) AAPA (applicant admitted prior art) in view of (2) ARTICLE 11/1999 and (3) PROIETTI.**

In summary, independent method<sup>1</sup> claim 10 deals with a method for measuring at least one monitored asset (computer component) belonging to at least one asset class over a network with a plurality of computers (cluster) comprising:

(a) receiving a data about quantity of assets (components) at the at least one asset class (CPU or storage) for each computer on the network, wherein each iCOD computer is an independently licensed system;

(b) summing (totalizing) the quantity of assets (components) of the at least one asset class for all of the plurality of iCOD computers on the network, thereby forming a sum of assets data, and

(c.) providing a notification (reminder) if the sum of assets data differs from a previously specified total data for the assets for the at least one asset class, wherein the assets may be either inactive or active, thereby allowing payment-free transfer of active assets from one iCOD computer to another iCOD computer within the network.

Note that the last step with the phrase "assets may be either inactive or active, thereby .... Within the network". The term "maybe" is considered as being optional since it reads over "is" or "is not", and therefore whatever limitations followed this "optional" limitation is considered as non-patentable weight since this is optional and not required. Moreover, what happens if the assets are "inactive"? Is there still a payment-

free transfer of active assets from one iCOD computer to another iCOD computer within the network?

Similarly, **AAPA**, as shown in the "Background" of pages 1-2, fairly discloses a method for measuring at least one monitored asset (computer component, i.e. CPU) belonging to at least one (or 1) asset class (CPU) over a network with a plurality of computers (cluster) comprising:

- (a) receiving a data about an asset (computer components, i.e. CPU) at the at least one asset class (CPU or storage) for each computer on the network,
- (b) summing the quantity of asset (computer components, CPUs) of the at least one asset class for each iCOD system (computer) individually on the network, thereby forming a sum of assets data, and

{see page 1, lines 15-27}

(c.) providing a notification (reminder) if the sum of assets data differs from a previously specified total data for the assets for the at least one asset class, wherein the assets may be either inactive or active.

{see page 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph or lines 22-27}.

Therefore, it appears that AAPA teaches the claimed invention except for carrying out step (b) for all of the plurality of iCOD computers on the network and allowing payment-free transfer of active assets from one iCOD computer to another iCOD computer within the network.

In a similar iCOD environment, **ARTICLE 11/1999** discloses future on-demand programs which will include other server (CPU) components, such as (1) memory and

(2) input/output (I/O), (3) storage sub-systems and (4) HP's HyperPlex clusters to meet demands of customers whose livelihoods depend on delivering high levels of capacity, performance and availability for Internet-based applications and "pay as you go" infrastructure program which allows dynamic response to ever-changing business demands which is sensible and beneficial (economical) to the server and storage customers {see page 1, paragraphs 2, 4, 5 and 6, page 2, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2nd}. ARTICLE 1999 also teaches the concept of providing iCOD solution for HP 9000 Enterprise Servers and when customers' needs change and they need more processing power, they can instantly activate the needed processors with a simple HP-UX command and there will be no charge for activation {see page 1, paragraphs 4, 5 and page 2, paragraph 2}.

It would have been obvious to modify the "on-demand" or "pay as you go" program/method of AAPA by adjusting the summing or sum of assets to include other computers (CPU/server) or components, such as (1) memory and (2) input/output (I/O), (3) storage sub-systems or (4) HP's HyperPlex clusters, in steps (a)-(c.) and on plurality of computers/servers (cluster or group) as taught by ARTICLE 11/1999 for one of the benefits cited above such as dynamic response, pay as you go, or sensible and beneficial (economical) to meet the consumer's demands for speed, content, availability, cost, etc. of internet-based applications which depend on those 4 variables cited above. Again, ARTICLE 1999 fairly teaches the users can instantly activate the needed processors with a command and no charge for activation, which indicate that the account/contract contains a plurality of iCOD computers (processors) or the provided clusters contain a plurality of iCOD computers (processors or servers). As for

the amended limitation of the last step, this is inherently included or taught in view of the teachings of ARTICLE 11/1999 in view of AAPA in view of the teachings of "no charge for activation" as cited in above. Moreover, putting more than one computer on the service contract or account would have been obvious as mere duplicating service/parts for multiple effects on the same account if desired. See *In re Harza*, 124 USPQ 378, 380 (CCPA 1960).

**PROIETTI** teaches a method for managing/monitoring/controlling integrated services to minimize the high recurring equipment subscription service costs for each equipment when applied to group of equipments or collective operations of equipments by managing/controlling and sharing a limited number of equipment subscription services (i.e. 2 subscription services) among a group of equipments (i.e. 3-5 equipments) by remote programming so that transfer of active asset/equipment usage upon activation is payment free since the service is limited to within the desired subscribed service and as the other equipment is deactivated {see col. 1, lines 20-67, col. 2, lines 1-32, and cols. 3-4 and 8, Figs. 1, 2 and 4}. It would have been obvious to modify the teachings of AAPA, step c) by managing/controlling and sharing a limited number of equipment subscription services (i.e. 2 subscription services) among a group of equipments (i.e. 3-5 equipments) by remote programming as taught by PROIETTI so that transfer of active asset/equipment usage upon activation is payment free since the service is limited to within the desired subscribed service and as the other equipment is deactivated, thus minimizing the high recurring equipment subscription service costs for

each equipment when applied to group of equipments or collective operations of equipments.

**As for dep. claim 11** (part of 10 above), which deals with well known audit reporting parameters/features, i.e. decrypting data due to sensitive data for personal or security reason, this is non-essential to the claimed invention and is well known and/or inherently included in AAPA or PROIETTI or would have been obvious to do so for security/personal reason.

**As for dep. claims 12-13** (part of 10 above), which deals with well known licensing auditing (iCOD / licensing) parameters, i.e. comparing actual/reported data to expected data for monitoring usage, these are well known and inherently included in AAPA {see page 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> full paragraph}.

**As for dep. claims 14-15** (part of 10 above), which deals with well known licensing auditing (iCOD) parameters, i.e. issuing a payment or an invoice from the system vendor, these are well known parameters and are taught in AAPA page 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.

**As for independent system<sup>1</sup> claim 1,** which is the system to carry out independent method claim 10 above, it's rejected over the system of AAPA /PROIETTI to carry out the method claim 1 as cited above. Moreover, it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to set up the proper system to carry out the method steps as shown in claim 10 above.

**As for dep. claims 2-5** (part of 1 above), which have the same limitations as in dep. claims 11-15 respectively, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in dep. claims 11-15 above.

**As for dep. claims 6-9** (part of 1 above), which deals with well known iCOD parameters, i.e. CPU, hard disk capacity, memory (storage), or I/O ports, etc., these are taught in AAPA.

**As for independent method<sup>2</sup> claim 16**, which explicitly differs from independent method claim 10 at the 1<sup>st</sup> step "receiving data about", however, the result of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> steps of claim 16, "measuring a quantity" and "transmitting the data about the quantity" producing the same result as in the 1<sup>st</sup> step of claim 10 above. Therefore, the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> steps of claim 10 are inherently included in the teachings of AAPA, page 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.

**As for dep. claims 17-18** (part of 16 above), which deals with well known licensing auditing (iCOD) parameters, i.e. measuring a quantity of inactive/active component, these are well known parameters and are taught in AAPA page 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.

**As for dep. claims 19-23** (part of 16 above), which have the same limitations as in dep. claims 11-15 respectively, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in dep. claims 11-15 above.

**As for independent method<sup>3</sup> claim 24**, which differs from independent method claim 10 at the 1<sup>st</sup> step "grouping the computers into at least one cluster", or "grouping", this concept is fairly taught in PROIETTI.

**As for dep. claim 25** (part of 10 above), which deals with well known audit reporting parameters of a clusters of network computers, i.e. registering the computers into the cluster, this is non-essential to the claimed invention and is inherently included in AAPA or PROIETTI or would have been obvious to do so for keeping track of the computers in a cluster.

**As for dep. claims 26-30** (part of 24 above), which have the same limitations as in dep. claims 11-15 respectively, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in dep. claims 11-15 above.

**8. Claims 10-15, 16-23, 1-9, 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (1) AAPA (applicant admitted prior art) in view of (2) HE et al or BROWN et al and further in view 3) PROIETTI.**

In summary, **independent method<sup>1</sup>** **claim 10** deals with a method for measuring at least one monitored asset (computer component) belonging to at least one asset class over a network with a plurality of computers (cluster) comprising:

(a) receiving a data about quantity of assets (components) at the at least one asset class (CPU or storage) for each computer on the network, wherein each iCOD computer is an independently licensed system;

(b) summing (totalizing) the quantity of assets (components) of the at least one asset class for all of the plurality of iCOD computers on the network, thereby forming a sum of assets data, and

(c.) providing a notification (reminder) if the sum of assets data differs from a previously specified total data for the assets for the at least one asset class, wherein the

assets may be either inactive or active, thereby allowing payment-free transfer of active assets from one iCOD computer to another iCOD computer within the network.

Note that the last step with the phrase "assets may be either inactive or active, thereby .... Within the network". The term "maybe" is considered as being optional since it reads over "is" or "is not", and therefore whatever limitations followed this "optional" limitation is considered as non-patentable weight since this is optional and not required. Moreover, what happens if the assets are "inactive"? Is there still a payment-free transfer of active assets from one iCOD computer to another iCOD computer within the network?

Similarly, **AAPA**, as shown in the "Background" of pages 1-2, fairly discloses a method for measuring at least one monitored asset (computer component, i.e. CPU) belonging to at least one (or 1) asset class (CPU) over a network with a plurality of computers (cluster) comprising:

(a) receiving a data about an asset (computer components, i.e. CPU) at the at least one asset class (CPU or storage) for each computer on the network,

(b) summing the quantity of asset (computer components, CPUs) of the at least one asset class for each iCOD system (computer) individually on the network, thereby forming a sum of assets data, and

{see page 1, lines 15-27}

(c.) providing a notification (reminder) if the sum of assets data differs from a previously specified total data for the assets for the at least one asset class, wherein the assets may be either inactive or active.

{see page 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph or lines 22-27}.

Therefore, it appears that AAPA teaches the claimed invention except for carrying out step (b) for all of the plurality of iCOD computers on the network and allowing payment-free transfer of active assets from one iCOD computer to another iCOD computer within the network.

**HE et al** is cited to teach the integration of multiple individual accounts into a consolidated server (account) to relieve the tremendous burden of managing multiple copies of user accounts and synchronizing these copies on different network elements {see col. 21, lines 55-65, col. 23, lines 35-65, col. 25, lines 25-35, Figs. 2-3}. It would have been obvious to modify the teachings of AAPA by combining the multiple user accounts into an integrated account as taught by HE et al for the benefit of relieving the tremendous burden of managing multiple copies of user accounts and synchronizing these copies on different network elements as cited above.

**BROWN et al** is cited to teach well known concept of having an account server that contains either a single server system or multiple server systems that provide universal access to the listings of the accounts {see col. 7, lines 10-25, Fig. 2}. It would have been obvious to modify the teachings of AAPA by combining the multiple user accounts into an integrated account as taught by HE et al for the benefit of relieving the tremendous burden of managing multiple copies of user accounts and synchronizing these copies on different network elements as cited above. It would have been obvious to modify the teachings of AAPA by providing multiple server systems that provide universal access to the listings of the accounts as taught by BROWN et al if desired.

Moreover, putting more than one computer on the service contract or account would have been obvious as mere duplicating service/parts for multiple effects on the same account if desired. See *In re Harza*, 124 USPQ 378, 380 (CCPA 1960).

AAPA/HE et al or BROWN et al teaches the claimed invention except for:

(d ) of "thereby allowing payment-free transfer of active assets from one iCOD computer to another iCOD computer within the network".

PROIETTI teaches a method for managing/monitoring/controlling integrated services to minimize the high recurring equipment subscription service costs for each equipment when applied to group of equipments or collective operations of equipments by managing/controlling and sharing a limited number of equipment subscription services (i.e. 2 subscription services) among a group of equipments (i.e. 3-5 equipments) by remote programming so that transfer of active asset/equipment usage upon activation is payment free since the service is limited to within the desired subscribed service and as the other equipment is deactivated {see col. 1, lines 20-67, col. 2, lines 1-32, and cols. 3-4 and 8, Figs. 1, 2 and 4}. It would have been obvious to modify the teachings of AAPA, step c) by managing/controlling and sharing a limited number of equipment subscription services (i.e. 2 subscription services) among a group of equipments (i.e. 3-5 equipments) by remote programming as taught by PROIETTI so that transfer of active asset/equipment usage upon activation is payment free since the service is limited to within the desired subscribed service and as the other equipment is deactivated, thus minimizing the high recurring equipment subscription service costs for

each equipment when applied to group of equipments or collective operations of equipments.

**As for dep. claim 11** (part of 10 above), which deals with well known audit reporting parameters/features, i.e. decrypting data due to sensitive data for personal or security reason, this is non-essential to the claimed invention and is well known and/or inherently included in AAPA or PROIETTI or would have been obvious to do so for security/personal reason.

**As for dep. claims 12-13** (part of 10 above), which deals with well known licensing auditing (iCOD / licensing) parameters, i.e. comparing actual/reported data to expected data for monitoring usage, these are well known and inherently included in AAPA {see page 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> full paragraph}.

**As for dep. claims 14-15** (part of 10 above), which deals with well known licensing auditing (iCOD) parameters, i.e. issuing a payment or an invoice from the system vendor, these are well known parameters and are taught in AAPA page 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.

**As for independent system<sup>1</sup> claim 1,** which is the system to carry out independent method claim 10 above, it's rejected over the system of AAPA /HE et al or BROWN et al /PROIETTI to carry out the method claim 1 as cited above. Moreover, it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to set up the proper system to carry out the method steps as shown in claim 10 above.

**As for dep. claims 2-5** (part of 1 above), which have the same limitations as in dep. claims 11-15 respectively, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in dep. claims 11-15 above.

**As for dep. claims 6-9** (part of 1 above), which deals with well known iCOD parameters, i.e. CPU, hard disk capacity, memory (storage), or I/O ports, etc., these are taught in AAPA.

**As for independent method<sup>2</sup> claim 16**, which explicitly differs from independent method claim 10 at the 1<sup>st</sup> step "receiving data about", however, the result of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> steps of claim 16, "measuring a quantity" and "transmitting the data about the quantity" producing the same result as in the 1<sup>st</sup> step of claim 10 above. Therefore, the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> steps of claim 10 are inherently included in the teachings of AAPA, page 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.

**As for dep. claims 17-18** (part of 16 above), which deals with well known licensing auditing (iCOD) parameters, i.e. measuring a quantity of inactive/active component, these are well known parameters and are taught in AAPA page 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.

**As for dep. claims 19-23** (part of 16 above), which have the same limitations as in dep. claims 11-15 respectively, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in dep. claims 11-15 above.

**As for independent method<sup>3</sup> claim 24**, which differs from independent method claim 10 at the 1<sup>st</sup> step "grouping the computers into at least one cluster", or "grouping", this concept is fairly taught in PROIETTI.

**As for dep. claim 25** (part of 10 above), which deals with well known audit reporting parameters of a clusters of network computers, i.e. registering the computers into the cluster, this is non-essential to the claimed invention and is inherently included in AAPA or HE et al col. 23, lines 1-35 or would have been obvious to do so for keeping track of the computers in a cluster.

**As for dep. claims 26-30** (part of 24 above), which have the same limitations as in dep. claims 11-15 respectively, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in dep. claims 11-15 above.

***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments, see paper, filed 9/24/08, with respect to the 103 rejections of claims 1-30 over AAPA /PROIETTI have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of claims 1-30 over AAPA /PROIETTI have been withdrawn. However, as for the argument with respect to the rejection of AAPA/ Article 11/1999/PROIETTI, it's not found persuasive because page 2 of the Article 1999, it indicates the use of "HPE 9000 Enterprise Servers....Servers running on the PA-8500 processor and subsequent PA-RISC (2) processors. So there appears to a plurality of servers containing multiple processors (CPU) such as 4 or 8 or 32 as indicated on page 1 previously.

***Conclusion***

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 2003/0079092, section [0006] discloses the benefit of iCOD for storage disk which is high cost for capital, operating expenses for power, raised floor spaces, heat, no return on assets or investments (ROA or ROI) on unused storage disk.

No claims are allowed.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct@uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

In receiving an Office Action, it becomes apparent that certain documents are missing, e. g. copies of references, Forms PTO 1449, PTO-892, etc., requests for copies should be directed to Tech Center 3600 Customer Service at (571) 272-3600, or e-mail [CustomerService3600@uspto.gov](mailto:CustomerService3600@uspto.gov) .

Any inquiry concerning the merits of the examination of the application should be directed to Dean Tan Nguyen at telephone number (571) 272-6806. My work schedule is normally Monday through Friday from 6:30 am - 4:00 pm. I am scheduled to be off every other Friday.

Should I be unavailable during my normal working hours, my supervisor Janice Mooneyham can be reached at (571) 272-6805.

The main FAX phone numbers for formal communications concerning this application are (571) 273-8300. My personal Fax is (571) 273-6806. Informal communications may be made, following a telephone call to the examiner, by an informal FAX number to be given.

/Tan Dean D. Nguyen/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3689